

REMARKS

Claim 1 has been amended to combine the corridor of claim 1 with a generic rescue means such representing the corridor of claim 6, the second elevator of claim 7 or the elevator with a crane of claim 7.

Amended claim 1 has be considered against Ho. How does not have a rescue means to connect with the platform and remove people therefrom.

Amended claim 1 has been considered against the Bates reference and is not obvious since the elements of a corridor supported on two elevators combined with a way to get people off the corridor supported by two elevators has not been disclosed.

Claim 2 has not been amended, however since claim 2 is dependent on claim 1 and claim 1 is believed to be allowable, claim 2 is believed to be allowable.

Claim 3 has not been amended, however since claim 3 is dependent on claim 1 and claim 1 is believed to be allowable, claim 3 is believed to be allowable.

Claim 5 has not been amended, however since claim 5 is dependent on claim 1 and claim 1 is believed to be allowable, claim 5 is believed to be allowable.

Claim 6 has been amended to more particularly point out that two corridors on two faces of the building have corner corridor portions to meet at a corner of the building.

Contrary to the examiner's rejection of claim 6 Bates does not have a corner portion extending from the elevator to the corner. The corner portion the examiner identified as 14 is the elevator not an extension. The claims have the elevator with a corridor on one side and the corner extension on the other side which the prior art does not have.

Claim 7 has been amended to particularly point out that a rescue elevator transports people from the corridor elevator by connected at the bottom of the corridor elevator and the top of the rescue elevator.

In the previous office action the examiner used Korchagin et al. publication 2004/0262086 as a reference against claim 7 which shows this feature.

The reference should not be used since 35 USC 102 (e) states that a publication in an application filed by another is what would prevent the application from becoming a patent. Here the same inventors are on both patents for the feature in question.

The examiner in the last office action stated that if the same assignee was on the publication and the current application then the referenced publication could not be applied. The same assignees are on both the present application and the publication therefore according to the examiner the reference can not be used against the claims.

The assignees of Publication 2004/0262086 as recorded at reel/ frame 016927/0822 are :

Korchagin, Pavel V.

Korchagin, Marina E.

Goldstein , Igor I. and

Tirskiy, Andrey G.

The assignees of the present application are as recorded at reel/ frame 017401/0080 are the same:

Korchagin, Pavel V.

Korchagin, Marina E.

Goldstein , Igor I. and

Tirskiy, Andrey G.

Claim 8 has been amended to particularly point out that a rescue elevator has a crane for rescuing people from the corridor.

In the previous office action the examiner used Korchagin et al. publication 2004/0262086 as a reference against claim 7 which shows this feature.

As shown above for claim 7 Korchagin et al. publication 2004/0262086 can not be used as a reference against the claim therefore claim 8 should be allowed.

Claims 9, 10, 11 and 12 were not amended and are believed to be allowable as they are all dependent on amended claim 1 which is believed to be allowable.

Claim 13 has been amended to add the rescue means running on at least one rail for removing people from the corridor. It is believed that the added feature makes the claim allowable as in claim 1.

Claims 14, 15, 16 and 18 are now allowable as being dependent on an allowable independent claim and because the previous rejection based on the Korchagin et al publication can not be used as a reference against the claims as shown above since the assignees for both the publication and the present application are the same.

The applicant believes that the new dependent claims 19 and 20 are also allowable as the amended independent claims are allowable as shown above.